

REMARKS

A. Claims

Claims 1, 5, 10, 18, and 31 have been amended. Claims 26-29, 33, 34, 36, and 37 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-11, 18-22, 30-32, and 35 are currently pending.

B. Interview Summary

On July 13, 2004, the Applicant and the Examiner had an interview initiated by the Applicant. During the interview several issues were discussed.

First, the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection and 35 U.S.C. 132 new matter rejection were discussed. Applicant pointed out to the Examiner that new FIG. 7 showed two modules (two of the FIG. 4 modules). Furthermore, FIG. 7 showed the two modules in series (which was clearly stated in the original specification at page 13, lines 17-18). The Examiner suggested the Applicant provide a number for the hole in the joinder module and add a statement to the specification to note that the guide module can join the neighboring module in series through the hole in the joinder module. The Examiner said this appears to be the clear intention of the original disclosure and therefore may not be new matter.

Second, Applicant also inquired into the Examiner's suggestions on page 5 with respect to claim 26 and page 6 with respect to claim 31. Examiner noted that the suggestion for claim 26 would at least narrow issues for claim 26. The Examiner further noted that the suggestion for claim 31 would make claim 31 allowable.

C. Amendments to the Specification and Drawings

Applicant respectfully asserts that new figure 7 and added text at pages 5 and 13 are not new matter. Applicant notes that no new matter was added because the added figure 7 and text at pages 5 and 13 only regenerate what was clearly supported in the original specification and figures. Applicant also respectfully asserts the original

specification and figures clearly support claims 26-29, 33, 34, 36, and 37. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant has cancelled new figure 7 and the added text at pages 5 and 13.

D. Rejection to Specification Amendment

The Examiner states: “For the page 13 amendment line 4 ‘430’ seems incorrect.” Applicant has corrected the specification. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to the specification.

E. Rejection to Claim 33 and 34

The Examiner states “Claim 33, line 2, is second connector correct.” The Examiner states “Claim 34 terms also questioned.” Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant notes that the original specification at page 13, lines 16-20 and original figure 4 clearly support the reading of claims 33 and 34. However, to expedite prosecution, claims 33 and 34 have been cancelled.

F. 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 26-29, 33, 34, 36, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Applicant respectfully asserts enabling support for claims 26-29, 33, 34, 36, and 37 can be found, for example, in Figure 4 and in the specification at page 13, lines 16-20. However, to expedite prosecution, claims 26-29, 33, 34, 36, and 37 have been cancelled.

The Office Action rejected claims 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Applicant respectfully asserts enabling support for claims 36 and 37 can be found, for example, in Figure 4 and in the specification at page 13, lines

16-20. However, as indicated above, to expedite prosecution, claims 36-37 have been cancelled.

F. 35 U.S.C. 132 Objections and 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) Objections

The Office Action has objected to the amendment filed March 10, 2004 under 35 U.S.C. 132 as introducing new matter and to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Examiner states: “Added fig. 7 seems intended to show module 430 as a sheet member with two openings for fitting over guide module pins 426. (Office Action, page 3). The Examiner further states: “As shown it is not clear that fig. 7 parts at leadlines 425, 430 are intended to define a ‘single’ sheet’ with two openings. In fig. 7 they appear as two adjacent sheets each with one opening. (Office Action, page 3).” Applicant respectfully disagrees. As seen in FIG. 4 (and FIG. 7), the joinder module is clearly coupled to the connector. Furthermore, while in another embodiment the module 430 may have two openings and may be a separate sheet, the module 430 in FIG. 4 shows only one opening and is shown attached to the connector and not as a separate sheet.

As stated in the last office action and as explained to the Examiner in the interview of July 13, new FIG. 7 and added text at pages 5 and 13 regenerate what was clearly supported in the original specification and figures. Applicant asserts no new matter was added and that all elements of the claims are supported in the original specification and figures. However, to expedite prosecution, figure 7 and the added text have been cancelled.

G. Section 103(a) Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10, 11, 18-22 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,075,704) (hereinafter “Amberg”) in view of Broeksteeg (U.S. Patent 5,066,236) (hereinafter

“Broeksteeg”), in further view of Provencher et al. (U.S. Patent 5,860,816) (hereinafter “Provencher”), in further view of HDM (hereinafter “HDM”), in further view of Weber et al. (U.S. Patent 4,820,169) (hereinafter “Weber”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection, however, to expedite prosecution, the Examiner’s suggested limitation to make claim 31 allowable has been incorporated into claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts the cited art does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a first set of one or more wafers, comprised between a top supporting member and a bottom supporting member” and “wherein the first power module and the first guide module are outside an enclosure formed by the top and bottom supporting members” as recited in claim 1. Applicant asserts claim 1 and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons. Applicant also disagrees with the rejection as to claims 10 and 18, however, to expedite prosecution, a similar limitation not disclosed, taught, or suggested has been added to claims 10 and 18. Applicant respectfully asserts claims 10 and 18 and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons.

The Office Action has rejected claims 18-22 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amberg, Broeksteeg, Provencher, HDM, Weber, in further view of Masuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,616,034) (hereinafter “Masuda”), in further view of Dent (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,617) (hereinafter “Dent”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections, however, to expedite prosecution, the Examiner’s suggested limitation to make claim 31 allowable has been incorporated into claim 18. Applicant respectfully asserts the cited art does not disclose, teach, or suggest “the first connector comprises one or more wafers between a top supporting member and a bottom supporting member” and “wherein the power module and the first guide module are outside an enclosure formed by the top and bottom supporting members” as recited in claim 18. Applicant asserts claim 18 and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons.

The Office Action has rejected claims 26-29 and 31-35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broeksteeg in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,472,354) (hereinafter “Chen”), in further view of Weber, in further view of HDM, in further view

of Masuda, in further view of Dent, in further view of Siwinski (U.S. Patent No. 5,116,239) (hereinafter "Siwinski"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection, however, to expedite prosecution, claims 26-29 have been cancelled, and the Examiner's suggested limitation has been incorporated into claim 31. The Examiner states: "Claim 31, with added limitation of 'power and guide modules being outside the enclosure formed by the top and bottom supporting members' would overcome the rejection. (Office Action, page 6)." The Examiner confirmed that this limitation would make claim 31 allowable during an interview with the Applicant on July 13, 2004. Applicant respectfully asserts claim 31 and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons.

H. Additional Remarks

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-1505\5681-52900\BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
700 Lavaca, Suite 800
Austin, Texas 78701-3102
Phone: (512) 853-8840
Date: 8-2-04